

THE HONORABLE KYMBERLY K. EVANSON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

JAMON RIVERA; CURTIS BANTA;  
YONKMAN CONSTRUCTION, INC.; PARAS  
HOMES, LLC; CONDRON HOMES, LLC;  
GARCO CONSTRUCTION, INC.; ARLINGTON  
360, LLC; HUSEBY HOMES, INC.; SPOKANE  
HOME BUILDERS ASSOCIATION;  
WASHINGTON STATE ASSOCIATION OF UA  
PLUMBERS, PIPEFITTERS AND HVAC/R  
SERVICE TECHNICIANS; LOCAL 32 OF UA  
PLUMBERS, PIPEFITTERS AND HVAC/R  
SERVICE TECHNICIANS; WASHINGTON  
AND NORTHERN IDAHO DISTRICT  
COUNCIL OF LABORERS; CITIZEN ACTION  
DEFENSE FUND; NATIONAL PROPANE GAS  
ASSOCIATION; AVISTA CORPORATION;  
CASCADE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION;  
and NORTHWEST NATURAL GAS  
COMPANY,

Plaintiffs,

v.

KJELL ANDERSON, JAY ARNOLD, TODD  
BEYREUTHER, JUSTIN BOURGAULT,  
DAIMON DOYLE, TOM HANDY, ANGELA  
HAUPT, ROGER HEERINGA, MATTHEW  
HEPNER, CRAIG HOLT, TYE MENSER,  
BENJAMIN OMURA, PETER RIEKE, KATY  
SHEEHAN, in their official capacities as  
Washington State Building Code Council  
Members; and BOB FERGUSON, in his official  
capacity as Attorney General of Washington,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-00677-KKE

**PLAINTIFFS' INITIATIVE 2066  
SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF**

CLIMATE SOLUTIONS; THE LANDS  
COUNCIL; SIERRA CLUB and  
WASHINGTON PHYSICIANS FOR  
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY,

Defendants-Intervenors.

Pursuant to the Court’s November 22, 2024 Minute Order, Plaintiffs “address[] the impact, if any, of the passage of Initiative 2066 on the issues presented in this case and/or the pending motion to dismiss.” See Dkt. 55.

Defendants appear poised to insist on maintaining the Energy Code, despite the voters’ adoption of Initiative 2066. To be sure, Initiative 2066 dooms the Washington State Energy Code (“Energy Code”) presently in effect—the same Energy Code Plaintiffs challenge here—and “[a] statutory change . . . is usually enough to render a case moot.” *Maldonado v. Morales*, 556 F.3d 1037, 1042 (9th Cir. 2009). But that is true only when the defendant concedes the effect of the changed law on its actions. *See Rupe v. Wood*, 93 F.3d 1434, 1438 (9th Cir. 1996) (addressing an affirmative representation by defendant that changed law would apply to plaintiff); *GEO Grp., Inc. v. Inslee*, 702 F. Supp. 3d 1043, 1051 (W.D. Wash. 2023) (addressing defendant’s concession that a Ninth Circuit opinion invalidating a California law also invalidates a Washington law). Here, in contrast, Defendants have made no such concession.

The Building Industry Association of Washington requested that the State Building Code Council (“SBCC”) comply with Initiative 2066 by undertaking emergency rulemaking to create a code complying with the Initiative. *See* Building Industry Association of Washington Letter to SBCC, (Nov. 13, 2024), <https://sbcc.wa.gov/sites/default/files/2024-11/241113%20BIAW%20Letter%20RE%20I-2066.pdf>. The SBCC rejected that request. Indeed, the SBCC went even further and expressed skepticism that Initiative 2066 impacts the current Energy Code at all. SBCC Special Council Meeting – November 22, 2024, 1:35:44 – 1:36:07, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uKJ82Cey31M> (adopting a motion stating the SBCC will “keep[] existing 2021 energy code in effect until by this process or directed otherwise by a court”); SBCC Council Meeting – November 15, 2024, 5:55, <https://www.youtube.com/>

1 watch?v=tNUqgR2np\_M (slide presented by SBCC Energy Code Technical Advisory Group  
 2 Chair Kjell Anderson stating that “[t]he energy codes may already comply with I-2066”). The  
 3 result is that the Energy Code amendments remain in force and continue to inflict harm on  
 4 Plaintiffs during the pendency of this action. This leaves a live issue. *See* Dkt. 47 at 16-17; Dkt.  
 5 52 at 14-17.

6 Here, Plaintiffs seek relief under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (“EPCA”). *See*  
 7 Dkt. 47 at 30. The EPCA basis for challenging the Energy Code amendments is unaffected by the  
 8 passage of Initiative 2066 because the Energy Code amendments remain preempted by EPCA.  
 9 Accordingly, this EPCA-based challenge remains reviewable, regardless of whether there is also  
 10 a state-law defect in the Energy Code.<sup>1</sup> And this Court remains capable of granting relief to  
 11 alleviate Plaintiffs’ harm.

12 In sum, Initiative 2066 has no effect on the EPCA-based challenge Plaintiffs are pursuing  
 13 in this case. EPCA renders the Energy Code unlawful regardless of whether Initiative 2066 also  
 14 does so.

---

23 <sup>1</sup> Notably, it is likely that Initiative 2066 will be subject to legal challenge, as groups have already  
 24 publicly stated they intend to challenge the measure after certification. Amanda Zhou, *WA passes*  
 25 *natural gas initiative; climate advocates plan lawsuit*, SEATTLE TIMES (Nov. 8, 2024) (“Opponents  
 26 of the initiative had already been planning legal action before the election . . . and intend to file a  
 27 challenge in superior court after the measure is certified.”). A legal challenge of this nature could  
 require around a year to resolve. *See, e.g., City of Burien v. Kiga*, 31 P.3d 659 (Wash. 2001)  
 (resolving lawsuit regarding initiative enacted November 7, 2000 on September 20, 2001).  
 Because of the present suit’s facial nature, the parties may very well obtain an answer to the EPCA  
 legal questions at issue here well before even the initial suit regarding Initiative 2066’s validity  
 concludes.

1 DATED: December 6, 2024

2  
3 LANE POWELL PC

4 By: s/ Devon McCurdy

5 Callie A. Castillo, WSBA No. 38214

6 Devon J. McCurdy, WSBA No. 52663

7 1420 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4200

8 P.O. Box 91302

9 Seattle, Washington 98111-9402

10 Telephone: 206.223.7000

11 castilloc@lanepowell.com

12 mcurdyd@lanepowell.com

13 *Counsel for the Homeowners, Builders, and Suppliers, and*  
14 *Unions*

15  
16 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.

17 By: s/ Clifford S. Davidson

18 Clifford S. Davidson, WSBA No. 48313

19 Amit D. Ranade, WSBA No. 34878

20 Mallory L. B. Satre, WSBA No. 50194

21 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.

22 600 University Street, Suite 310

23 Seattle, WA 98101

24 (206) 741-1402

25 csdavidson@swlaw.com

26 aranade@swlaw.com

27 msatre@swlaw.com

*Counsel for the Utilities*

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

By: *s/ Megan H. Berge*

---

Megan H. Berge (DC Bar No. 98371)

Scott Novak (DC Bar No. 1736274)

700 K Street NW

Washington, D.C. 20001

Telephone: 202.639.1308

megan.berge@bakerbotts.com

scott.novak@bakerbotts.com

J. Mark Little (TX Bar No. 24078869)

910 Louisiana Street

Houston, TX 77002

Telephone: 713.229.1489

mark.little@bakerbotts.com

*Counsel for the Utilities*